



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/056,420	01/24/2002	Ronald B. Moss	P-IM 5158	8063
23601	12/16/2003			
CAMPBELL & FLORES LLP 4370 LA JOLLA VILLAGE DRIVE 7TH FLOOR SAN DIEGO, CA 92122			EXAMINER PARKIN, JEFFREY S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1648	

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/056,420

Applicant(s)

MOSS, RONALD B., ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1648

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) Z.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Detailed Office Action**

***Status of the Claims***

1. Claims 1-26 are pending in the instant application. No preliminary amendments accompanied the filing.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

5 2. The information disclosure statement filed 16 July, 2002, has been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered.

***35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph***

10 3. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Two separate requirements are set forth under this statute: (1) the claims must set forth the subject matter that  
15 applicants regard as their invention; and (2) the claims must particularly point out and distinctly define the metes and bounds of the subject matter that will be protected by the patent grant. The claims reference HIV-infected individuals and HIV immunogenic compositions. However, it is not readily manifest if the claim  
20 language refers to HIV-1-, HIV-2-, or both HIV-1- and HIV-2-infected individuals. The disclosure appears to be directed toward HIV-1-infected patients and an HIV-1 immunogen. Appropriate correction is required.

***35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph***

25 4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112:

30 The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person

skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5

10

5. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The claims are directed toward a method of treating HIV-infected individuals through structured treatment interruptions (STIs) with immune-based therapies. Antiviral therapy is ceased and patients are immunized with an "HIV immunogenic composition" that presumably leads to an immune system boost.

15

20

The legal considerations that govern enablement determinations pertaining to undue experimentation have been clearly set forth. *Enzo Biochem, Inc.*, 52 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (C.A.F.C. 1999). *In re Wands*, 8 U.S.P.Q.2d 1400 (C.A.F.C. 1988). *Ex parte Forman* 230 U.S.P.Q. 546 (PTO Bd. Pat. App. Int., 1986). The courts concluded that several factual inquiries should be considered when making such assessments including the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims. *In re Rainer*, 52 C.C.P.A. 1593, 347 F.2d 574, 146 U.S.P.Q. 218 (1965). The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to a number of these considerations as follows:

25

30

1) The state-of-the-art as it pertains to HIV-1 and -2 vaccine development is replete with failure. To date, there are no successful HIV-1 or -2 vaccines. The failure to identify and develop suitable vaccines has been due to several factors

including: (I) the failure to identify the correlates of protective immunity; (ii) the failure to identify suitable immunogens, adjuvants, routes of administration, and immunization regimens; (iii) the quasispecies nature of lentiviral infection which leads to immune escape, and (iv) the lack of an adequate animal model that is reasonably predictive of clinical efficacy (Haynes *et al.*, 1996; Lee, 1997; Letvin, 1998; Burton and Moore, 1998; Johnston, 2000; Feinberg and Moore, 2002).

2) The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to the correlates of protective or therapeutic immunity. In order to assess the true effectiveness of any given immunogen, the skilled artisan would need to know the nature, duration, and specificity of the immune response that confers a salubrious effect on the patient. However, the disclosure fails to provide any guidance pertaining to this subject.

3) The disclosure fails to provide adequate guidance pertaining to the preparation of suitable immunogens, adjuvants, routes of administration, and immunization regimens. In order to practice the claimed invention, the skilled artisan would require a knowledge of these parameters. However, the disclosure is silent pertaining to these various parameters.

4) The disclosure fails to provide any working embodiments. It was noted that the disclosure provided some preliminary data from a small clinical sample involving the immunogen REMUNE. However, this data cannot be relied upon at this point in time for enablement purposes. It is not readily apparent from reviewing the data that the STI regimen followed by REMUNE immunization was actually providing a therapeutic or protective immune response. The example failed to provide details about the immunological status of each patient participating in the trial. The study failed to measure meaningful immunological and virological indices that would be predictive of vaccine efficacy.

5) The claims are of considerable breadth and encompass any "HIV immunogenic composition." As noted *supra*, there are a number of limitations associated with vaccine development including the identification of suitable immunogens and the correlates of protective immunity. The disclosure fails to provide adequate support for an given HIV immunogen.


When all the aforementioned factors are considered *in toto*, it would clearly require undue experimentation from the skilled artisan to practice the claimed invention.

#### *Correspondence*

6. The Art Unit location of your application in the Patent and Trademark Office has changed. To facilitate the correlation of related papers and documents for this application, all future correspondence should be directed to **art unit 1648**.

7. Correspondence related to this application may be submitted to Group 1600 by facsimile transmission. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). Official communications should be directed toward the following Group 1600 fax number: (703) 872-9306. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 308-2227. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisors, Laurie Scheiner or James Housel, can be reached at (703) 308-1122 or (703) 308-4027, respectively. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Respectfully,

  
Jeffrey S. Parkin, Ph.D.  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1648

12 December, 2003